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1 – O Utilitarismo tem as suas origens no hedonismo dos antigos Cirenaicos e Epicuristas. O criador do Utilitarismo moderno foi o filósofo do século XVIII Jeremy Bentham. Pretendia tornar a ética quantitativa, da mesma forma que Isaac Newton tinha feito com a ciência em geral. Bentham queria criar um sistema que definisse certo e errado e que pudesse beneficiar toda a sociedade. Cria o ponto de vista utilitarista. O contributo mais útil para qualquer dilema moral é a felicidade, o que conduz as pessoas às decisões éticas correctas. O princípio da utilidade é definido pela subtracção prazer-dor. A maximização da utilidade e a minimização da dor são objectivos. Bentham sintetiza as contribuições de Hume (Ethics should be based on what is most useful. To determine whether an action is right or wrong one must look at what would be most useful in that situation) e Hutcheson (happiness is most important in determining what is right or wrong - “greatest happiness for the greatest number.” Embora nem Hume nem Hutcheson possam ser considerados utilitaristas, a junção da utilidade e da felicidade transformou o Utilitarismo numa teoria Ética. Desejos de reforma social.

Diferencia-se do **Egoísmo** – a doutrina de acordo com a qual a acão moral correcta é aquela que corresponde ao interesse próprio do indivíduo e que apresenta como o princípio moral decisivo a ideia da vantagem pessoal, ganho ou auto-interesse. O egoísmo moral não afirma que todos os indivíduos deverão ser egoístas ou agir dessa forma ou que devem buscar o seu prazer, causando mal aos outros. Também não advoga a desonestidade ou que ela é inerentemente algo de bom. Limita-se a afirmar que estas acções podem conduzir a vantagens,

Moral egoism is based on psychological egoism, according to which all human behaviour is motivated by self-interest (=welfare, well-being). Self-interest is understood as either: one’s desire (self-regarding / not self-regarding) or possession of states independently of being desired (virtue, knowledge, peace…).

Diferencia-se do **Hedonismo** – a doutrina que considera que o prazer é o único bem. Os indivíduos buscam o prazer e devem-no fazer porque só prazer é o bem.

To say "all pleasure is intrinsically good" is not to say "all pleasure is good, simply." Though pleasure is the only intrinsically and ultimate good, it is not the only thing desirable, other things are desirable at least as a means to something (peace, money, education…) Some pleasures are not good because they lead to pain instead of pleasure (taking drugs, getting drunk, making fun of other people…)

A eliminação da dimensão **motivacional**. O utilitarismo é **consequencialista e telológico**.

According to classical utilitarian moral theory, when we evaluate human acts or practices, we consider neither the nature of the acts or practices nor the motive for which people do what they do. As Mill put it, “He who saves a fellow creature from drowning does what is morally right, whether his motive be duty or the hope of being paid for his trouble.” It is the result of one’s action—that a life is saved— that matters morally. According to utilitarianism, we ought to decide which action or practice is best by considering the likely or actual consequences of each alternative.

2 – Todos os humanos têm uma tendência natural para procurar o **prazer** e evitar a **dor**. Todos os humanos, por natureza, buscam a **utilidade** – prevalência do prazer sobre a dor. A utilidade de cada um conta tanto como a utilidade dos outros – princípio de **igualdade**. O objectivo da moralidade é conseguir a maior utilidade global.

“Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pleasure and pain. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand, the standard of right and wrong, on the other, the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: Every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire: But, in reality, he will remain subject to it all the while.” Bentham.

“By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered . . . .” Bentham.

“The community is a fictitious body, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting as it were its members. The interest of the community then is what? — the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it.” Bentham.

3 – A utilidade é avaliada e estabelecida de uma forma exclusivamente quantitativa. Não há considerações sobre a alegada qualidade da mesma. Existem sete critérios quantitativos em Bentham.

1. Intensidade – qual é a sua força?

Act A gives forty people each mild pleasure (40x2=80 degrees of pleasure). Act B gives ten people each intense pleasure (10x10=100 degrees of pleasure). Moments of happiness or pleasure are not all alike. Some are more intense than others. The thrill of some exciting adventure—say, running river rapids—may produce a more intense pleasure than the serenity we feel standing before a beautiful vista. All else being equal, the more intense the pleasure, the better.

1. Duração – quanto tempo dura?

Act A gives three people each eight days of happiness (3x8=24 days of happiness). Act B gives six people each two days of happiness (6x2=12 days of happiness). Intensity is not all that matters regarding pleasure. The more serene pleasure may last longer. This also must be factored in our calculation. The longer lasting the pleasure, the better, all else being equal.

1. Certeza – qual a probabilidade da sua ocorrência?

Act A has a 90 percent chance of giving eight people each five days of pleasure (40 days X 0.90 =36 days of pleasure). Act B has a 40 percent chance of giving ten people each seven days of pleasure (70 days X 0.40 = 28 days of pleasure). If before acting we are attempting to decide between two available alternative actions, we must estimate the likely results of each before we compare their net utility. If we are considering whether to go out for some sports competition, for example, we should consider our chances of doing well. We might have greater hope of success trying something else. It may turn out that we ought to choose an act with lesser rather than greater beneficial results if the chances of it happening are better.

1. Propinquidade – quão próximo está?
2. Fecundidade – qual a probabilidade de produzir mais?

The fruitfulness of experiencing pleasure depends on whether it makes us more capable of experiencing similar or other pleasures. For example, the relaxing event may make one person more capable of experiencing other pleasures of friendship or understanding, whereas the thrilling event may do the same for another. The fruitfulness depends not only on the immediate pleasure but also on the long-term results.

1. Pureza – quão livre de dor está?
2. Extensão – número de pessoas que são afectadas.

“Prejudice apart, the game of push-pin is of equal value with the arts and sciences of music and poetry. If the game of push-pin furnish more [utility], it is more valuable than either.” Bentham.

4 – Como produzir uma **escolha moral utilitária** – Determinar quem é afectado pela escolha. Determinar as alternativas. Usando os sete critérios, determinar, para cada uma das alternativas, a utilidade para o indivíduo afectado. Somar as utilidades totais para cada alternativa. Escolher a utilidade que gera a maior utilidade global. Moral teleológica e hedonista?

Act A produces twelve units of happiness and six of unhappiness (12 - 6 = 6 units of happiness). Act B produces ten units of happiness and one of unhappiness (10 - 1 = 9 units of happiness). When an act produces both pleasure or happiness and pain or unhappiness, we can think of each moment of unhappiness as canceling out a moment of happiness so that what is left to evaluate is the remaining or net happiness or unhappiness. We are also to think of pleasure and pain as coming in bits or moments. We can then calculate this net amount by adding and subtracting units of pleasure and displeasure. This is a device for calculating the greatest amount of happiness even if we cannot make mathematically exact calculations.

5 – John Stuart Mill é afilhado de Bentham – acredita que a felicidade, e não o prazer, deve ser o padrão da utilidade. Mill concorda com Bentham a respeito de o bem-estar das pessoas ser da máxima importância. Embora defenda o princípio da utilidade, distancia-se de Bentham a respeito da dimensão quantitativista, o que o leva a falar de prazeres superiores e inferiores (dimensão qualitativa). Os prazeres do corpo são tipicamente inferiores e os intelectuais são normalmente superiores.

“If one of two [pleasures] is, by those who are competently acquainted with both, placed so far above the other that they prefer it, even though knowing it to be attended with a greater amount of discontent, and would not resign it for any quantity of the other pleasure which their nature is capable of, we are justified in ascribing to the preferred enjoyment a superiority in quality, so far outweighing quantity as to render it, in comparison, of small account.” John Stuart Mill.

“Few human creatures would consent to be changed into any of the lower animals, for a promise of the fullest allowance of a beast’s pleasures; no intelligent human being would consent to be a fool, no instructed person would be an ignoramus, no person of feeling and conscience would be selfish and base, even though they should be persuaded that the fool, the dunce, or the rascal is better satisfied with his lot than they are with theirs. They would not resign what they possess more than he for the most complete satisfaction of all the desires which they have in common with him. It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And, if the fool, or the pig, are a different opinion, it is because they only know their own side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both sides.” John Stuart Mill.





Em última análise, Mill parece considerar que para se saber quais os prazeres que são qualitativamente superiores, deveremos colocar a pergunta a alguém de elevada cultura ou gosto refinado. Esta orientação permite traçar um enviesamento elitista em Mills que faz corresponder as escolhas do seu grupo social às escolhas certas. A introdução do elemento qualitativo no cálculo das utilidades cria mais problemas do que aqueles que resolve.

6 - Utilitarismo de Acto ou **Act Utilitarisnism**

“The measure of the value of an act is the amount by which it increases general utility or happiness. An act is to be preferred to its alternatives according to the extent of the increase it achieves, compared to the extent the alternatives would achieve. An action is thus good or bad in proportion to the amount it increases (or diminishes) general happiness, compared to the amount that could have been achieved by acting differently. Act utilitarianism is distinctive not only in the stress on utility, but in the fact that each individual action is the primary object of ethical evaluation.”

7 – Utilitarismo de regras ou **Rule Utilitarianism** – Produzir uma análise utilitarista para cada escolha moral é virtualmente impossível. Deste modo, muitos utilitaristas contemporâneos preferem aplicar o utilitarismo de regras. Este tipo de utilitarismo leva a seguir as regras que, no longo-prazo, produzem a maior utilidade global. Com este género de orientação, a análise utilitária é feita uma única vez, no momento de decidir quais as regras que devem ser seguidas. Após desta decisão, a escolha moral é apenas uma questão de seguir as regras.

“It maintains that the correct principles of right and wrong are those that would maximize happiness if society adopted them. Rule utilitarianism applies the utilitarian standard not directly to individual actions but rather to the choice of the moral principles that are to guide individual action.” (Shaw, 2011)

an act is right if and only if it is required by a rule that is itself a member of a set of rules whose acceptance would lead to greater utility for society than any available alternative.

8 - “**The good of the many outweighs the good of the one**.” O Utilitarismo parece legitimar o sacrifício de um indivíduo pelo bem (utilidade) do grupo. Mas será isto justo? As consequências estão em contradição com a intuição de que cada ser humano possui uma dignidade própria que não deve ser sacrificada, mesmo que a sociedade como um todo possa ganhar com o sacrifício.

9 – Corolário – A correcção ou erro de um acto estão separadas da bondade ou maldade de um agente – o valor da acção é diferente do valor do agente. A acção moral certa é aquela que maximiza o bem. O princípio geral da utilidade não fornece uma regra sobre o valor moral da acção, em face das consequências reais ou previstas, antes indicando que devemos fazer aquilo que temos razão para acreditar trará as melhores consequências entre as alternativas conhecidas e disponíveis.

10 – Principais **pontos fortes**: Facilidade de compreensão; Pragmatismo e utilidade na vida real; Naturalidade na compreensão das consequências das acções na felicidade e na dor; Importância de pensar as preferências dos outros; Flexibilidade e acomodação de circunstâncias excepcionais.

11 – Principais **pontos fracos** – As consequências são muito difíceis de prever; as injustiças não são tratadas de forma justa – pode haver uma maldosa regra da maioria; Dificuldade de qualificar os prazeres; Os direitos podem ser abusados em nome de bem maior (anular as liberdades); O cálculo hedonista não pode ser usado na vida real; Desrespeito pelo dever (as promessas perdem o seu valor); Incorre na falácia naturalista – o dever não conduz ao ser – o desejo nem sempre é bom; Foco no bem maior elimina os interesses individuais.

Promises are made on the understanding that they will be kept, something the rule utilitarian recognises as promoting happiness. However, whilst Act utilitarians may make a promise in a particular situation there can be no guarantee that they will always uphold promise keeping; and so one could never trust them– as there is no confidence they will keep their promise!

**Complexity** - When we consider all of the variables concerning pleasure and happiness that are to be counted when trying to estimate the “greatest amount of pleasure or happiness,” the task of doing so looks extremely difficult. We must consider how many people will be affected by alternative actions, whether they will be pleased or pained by them, how pleased or pained they will be and for how long, and the likelihood that what we estimate will happen will, in fact, come to be. In addition, if we want to follow Mill rather than Bentham, we must consider whether the pleasures will be the more lowly sensual pleasures, the higher types of more intellectual pleasures, or something in between. Using **hedons or utils**?

**More utility or more people**? A more difficult problem in how to apply the principle of utility comes from Mill’s specific formulation of it. It may well be that in some cases, at least, one cannot both maximize happiness and make the greatest number of people happy. Thus, one choice may produce 200 units of happiness—but for just one person. The other alternative might produce 150 units of happiness, 50 for each of three people. If the maximization of overall happiness is taken as primary, then we should go with the first choice; if the number of people is to take precedence, then we should go with the second choice. Most readings of Mill, however, suggest that he would give preference to the overall maximization of utility. In that case, how the happiness was distributed (to one versus three) would not in itself count.

**Utilitarianism and Personal Integrity** - A more substantive criticism of utilitarianism concerns its universalist and maximizing agenda; that we should always do that which maximizes overall happiness. Many critics have noted that utilitarian theory does not allow us to privilege our own happiness over that of others. Nor can we privilege the happiness of those we love. In determining what to do, I can give no more weight to my own projects or my own children than other people’s similar projects or others’ children. For some philosophers, the idea that I must treat all persons equally is contrary to common sense, which tells us that we ought to care for our own children more than we care for the children of distant others.

**Ends and Means** - “The end justifies the means.” People often utter this phrase with a certain amount of disdain. Utilitarianism, as a consequentialist moral theory, holds that it is the consequences or ends of our actions that determine whether particular means to them are justified. This seems to lead to conclusions that are contrary to commonsense morality. For example, wouldn’t it justify punishing or torturing an innocent person, a “scapegoat,” in order to prevent a great evil or to promote a great good? Or could we not justify on utilitarian grounds the killing of some individuals for the sake of the good of a greater number, perhaps in the name of population control? Or could I not make an exception for myself from obeying a law, alleging that it is for some greater long-term good? Utilitarians might respond by noting that such actions or practices will probably do more harm than good, especially if we take a long-range view.



